

These are my comments in favor of the passage of Network Neutrality. By "Network Neutrality" I am referring to a concept whereby all content crossing a network is treated equally, where the only limiting factors of service is the physical bandwidth limitations of networking hardware.

-Telcos/internet providers wish to be permitted to create a "tiered" internet, where premium services will be given faster, better quality connections than standard services. These premium services will, of course, have an extra fee associated. Their reasoning is that content providers will have to pay more to have their content reach more people, through better service.

The reasoning of the Telcos/internet providers on this issue are ill-founded. Internet users (everyday American consumers) and content providers already pay for the use of the internet in a fair and balanced fashion. An internet user must pay for their connection, having to pay more if they consume more (they could buy a slower dial-up service, or they could buy a more expensive and faster broadband service). A Content provider must pay for their bandwidth costs to connect to the internet; they pay for the volume of data requested by internet users. If Google.com becomes more popular, they will have to pay more to buy more bandwidth so that more users can access their site. This system is already in place, it is already fair and balanced. The telcos/internet providers simply want an excuse to charge more money to popular content providers- At best, this can be considered double-charging for the same service; At worst, it is a ransom fee "pay us more or you will get put on the slow line."

-Telcos/internet providers claim that the ability to charge more for premium services will help progress in the internet. By charging content providers, the consumers will be spared the brunt of the cost for making the internet "faster" and "better".

This entire argument is faulty. First, the consumers will not be spared any expense if network neutrality is lost. Content providers will have to pass the costs to the users through website subscription fees or more intrusive advertisements. In the end, American internet

consumers will bare the full expense of this new "tiered" internet. Second: allowing a tiered network will not promote progress, it will stunt it. If telcos/internet providers are permitted to give better service to premium services, they will take that bandwidth from the standard services. This allows a telco/internet provider to claim a much faster, better service without having to actually upgrade the physical networking infrastructure. There will be "Television over the internet" but people may notice that email travels much more slowly! As it stands now (without the tiered internet, with network neutrality more or less the standard in practice) the internet has progressed well enough- the fees for internet service allow the telcos/internet providers to upgrade the physical network, everything gets faster and better. This development will be squelched if network neutrality is abolished.

Simply look at the track record of American telcos/internet providers: They have been granted regulated monopoly powers over the internet's physical infrastructure. They take money from American taxpayers with the stated goal of improving the network for American users. The result of this trust is that the United States is one of the worst-ranked "developed" nations in the world as far as broadband availability. There is no real competition- the choices of the American Taxpayer are between the oligopoly of one cable broadband provider, and one telephone(DSL) broadband provider. telcos/internet broadband providers took so much money and allowed America to fall into a relative stone-age in terms of network connectivity- and now they want more money.

-One of the results of loss of Network Neutrality will be the loss of competition on internet services. Using Voice over IP (voip) telephone communications as an example. There are many examples in the past where an internet provider will begin offering a voip service to their customers while simultaneously blocking/degrading the traffic of all voip competitors. The Consumer then chooses the voip service of their internet provider, because it appears better. If network neutrality were a requirement, then anti-competitive incidents like this will be outlawed- as they should be. If network neutrality is lost, then this anti-competitive strategy of degrading the services of competitors will continue, to the detriment of the American Consumer.

-The truth of the matter is that the fight against network neutrality is a greed-driven crusade by Telecommunications/Internet Providers to allow them to charge more and provide less to the American Consumer. I urge the FCC to pass regulation forcing internet providers to give equal service to all forms of internet traffic.